Beyond lensing by the cosmological constant

Valerio Faraoni[1,*] and Marianne Lapierre-Léonard[2,†]

[1] *Physics Department and STAR Research Cluster, Bishop's University, 2600 College Street, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada J1M 1Z7*

[2] *Physics Department, Bishop's University, 2600 College Street, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada J1M 1Z7*

The long-standing problem of whether the cosmological constant affects directly the deflection of light caused by a gravitational lens is reconsidered. We use a new approach based on the Hawking quasilocal mass of a sphere grazed by light rays and on its splitting into local and cosmological parts. Previous literature restricted to the cosmological constant is extended to any form of dark energy accelerating the universe in which the gravitational lens is embedded.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.62.Sb, 98.80.Jk, 04.20.Cv

arXiv:1608.03164v2 [gr-qc] 9 Jan 2017

The deflection of light by a localized mass is one of the three classical tests of General Relativity [1, 2] and the verification of Einstein's prediction for the deflection angle of light rays grazing the Sun by Eddington [3] during the 1919 solar eclipse turned Einstein into a celebrity. Following the discovery of the first gravitational lens system 0957+561 in 1979 [4], gravitational lensing rapidly developed to become a major tool of cosmology and astrophysics, providing information about the abundance and distribution of dark matter at various scales, about microlensing by stars and (exo-)planets, and revealing gravitational lens systems acting as giant telescopes [5, 6]. In addition to lensing by localized mass distributions, in the 1980s researchers started to enquire about the direct contribution to lensing by the cosmological constant Λ. Today, it is only natural to investigate further this subject, since we now know that the present cosmic expansion accelerates due to a true or an effective cosmological constant [7–11]. The mystery of what propels the acceleration of the cosmic expansion and the fact that the cosmological constant energy density (the density of quantum vacuum) is 120 orders of magnitudes smaller than what predicted (*i.e.*, the cosmological constant problem) are two major unsolved puzzles of modern theoretical physics [12, 13]. During the last decade there has been an active debate about the direct effect of the cosmological constant in lensing, with various approaches often leading to opposite results (although sometimes these are due to different definitions of the physical quantities involved, see *e.g.* Ref. [8]). The debate is not settled and here we contribute a different approach which is more general, simple yet powerful, and covariant. Almost all the existing works on the subject are restricted to studying lensing in a Schwarzschild-de Sitter/Kottler spacetime with a central mass m and the cosmological constant Λ [14], to a vacuole in the Kottler geometry, or (rarely) to the McVittie geometry [15]. The Kottler spacetime is (locally) static and, therefore, very special and the McVittie solution of the Einstein equations is also special and may be misleading when drawing general conclusions. It is preferable to study instead lensing by a localized mass distribution in *any* realistic (accelerating or, in principle, even decelerating) Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) universe perturbed by local mass distributions acting as lenses. The statement that the cosmological constant does or does not contribute directly to light deflection ultimately relies on splitting the lensing mass-energy enclosed in a sphere grazed by the light rays into a local (Newtonian) part which is attributed to the lens and a cosmological contribution due to the cosmological constant or to the cosmic fluid. However, this decomposition issue is left implicit in the existing investigations of this subject because the formalisms used are not suitable for tackling this problem. Here we address explicitly the notion of "mass" deflecting light rays, keeping in mind that the mass of a gravitating system is a nontrivial concept in non-asymptotically flat spacetimes describing non-isolated lenses, which are necessarily embedded in the universe (taking into account the contribution of Λ means, by definition, that the lens is not asymptotically flat). This fact has led to various quasilocal energy definitions (see Ref. [16] for a recent review). The total mass-energy of a gravitating system includes contributions from rest mass, kinetic and potential energies, and the energy of the gravitational field, which itself gravitates. The essence of the Equivalence Principle constituting the foundation of General Relativity and of all metric theories of gravity [1, 2] is that the gravitational field can be eliminated locally. Therefore, to this order, one cannot introduce a local energy density for the gravitational field. The next best thing is to define the total energy of matter and fields enclosed by a compact, spacelike 2-surface, *i.e.*, quasilocally, and there are several possible definitions of quasilocal mass [16]. Here we adopt the Hawking-Hayward quasilocal energy construct [17, 18] which, in spherical symmetry (to which, although not necessary, we restrict for simplicity following the previous literature on the subject), reduces to the better known Misner-Sharp-Hernandez mass [19] widely used in relativistic fluid mechanics and in black hole thermodynamics. The original definition of Hawking [17] (to which Hayward later added a term [18]) is based on a two-

* vfaraoni@ubishops.ca

† mlapierre12@ubishops.ca

dimensional spacelike, compact, embedded hypersurface $\mathcal{S}$ and on integrating over $\mathcal{S}$ the squares of the expansion and shear of the outgoing and ingoing null geodesic congruences from $\mathcal{S}$. Therefore, the basic idea is that the Hawking quasilocal construct weights the total mass in $\mathcal{S}$ by using its effect on light rays, which fits well the lensing problem that we consider here. This mass concept has been applied recently to the study of two problems in cosmology, Newtonian N-body simulations of large scale structure formation [20] and the turnaround radius of a large structure in an accelerating universe [21]. The Hawking-Hayward quasilocal mass splits uniquely into three contributions: a local one, a cosmological one, and a (much smaller) one describing the interaction between the previous two. This feature is well suited for the discussion of lensing by the cosmological constant or by the dark energy propelling the accelerated expansion of the cosmos.

We begin by restricting ourselves to General Relativity and by considering a spherically symmetric perturbation of a spatially flat FLRW universe, which is localized in a region of size much smaller than the Hubble radius H^{-1} and deflects light rays propagating nearby. The usual thin lens and small deflection angle approximations [5, 6] are adopted here. We use units in which the speed of light c and Newton's constant G are unity. The line element in the conformal Newtonian gauge is

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = a^2(\eta)\left[-(1+2\phi)\,d\eta^2 + (1-2\phi)\left(dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2_{(2)}\right)\right] \equiv a^2 ds^2\,, \tag{1}$$

where the scale factor $a(\eta)$ is a function of the conformal time η, $\phi(r) = -m/r$ describes the local spherical perturbation with Newtonian mass m, and $d\Omega^2_{(2)} = d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\varphi^2$ is the metric on the unit 2-sphere. Working to first order and following standard literature, we do not include vector and tensor perturbations in the line element (1). Vector and tensor perturbations would not be negligible to second order due to mode-mode coupling, but they can be safely neglected to first order for gravitational lenses which do not have relativistic peculiar velocities [22, 23].[1] Moreover, we restrict to spherical scalar perturbations: this assumption is not strictly necessary, but it greatly simplifies the discussion and allows one to speak of "the deflection angle" in the same way that "the deflection angle by the Sun" was calculated by Einstein and appears in relativity textbooks. Moreover, spherically symmetric gravitational lenses are used almost universally in the literature on lensing contributions by the cosmological constant.

The Hubble function is $H(t) = \dot{a}/a$, where an overdot denotes differentiation with respect to the comoving time t of the FLRW background, which is related to the conformal time η by $dt = a d\eta$. We denote with a tilde geometric quantities in the perturbed FLRW space (1) obtained by means of a conformal transformation of the linearized Schwarzschild metric (usually written as $g_{ab} \to \tilde{g}_{ab} = \Omega^2 g_{ab}$)

$$ds^2 = -(1+2\phi)\,d\eta^2 + (1-2\phi)\left(dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2_{(2)}\right) \tag{2}$$

with conformal factor $\Omega = a(\eta)$. A possible time-dependence of the perturbation potential ϕ is neglected since the latter describes a Newtonian lens affected very little by the cosmological expansion over the time during which lensing takes place (lensing by the localized mass m only occurs when the light rays are near it). The reason to write explicitly the line element (1) as the result of a conformal rescaling is that null geodesics are conformally invariant and angles are left invariant by conformal transformations. The deflection angle of light rays in Schwarzschild space (in the small angle approximation) is

$$\Delta\varphi = \frac{4m}{r} \tag{3}$$

to first order in the Newtonian potential $\phi = -m/r$, where r is the impact parameter. The deflection angle will be the same in the conformally rescaled spacetime (1), $\Delta\tilde{\varphi} = \Delta\varphi$.

The second ingredient of our new approach consists of noting that a light ray deflected at (areal) radius R "sees" the entire physical mass contained in a sphere of radius R. (Here we employ the areal, instead of coordinate, radius because the former is a geometric quantity defined independently of the coordinate system.) This mass is given by the Hawking-Hayward/Misner-Sharp-Hernandez construct $M_{\rm MSH}$ [19]. The latter is defined, in General Relativity and in a spherically symmetric spacetime with areal radius R, by [19, 25]

$$1 - \frac{2M_{\rm MSH}}{R} = \nabla^c R \nabla_c R\,. \tag{4}$$

This scalar equation and the fact that R is a geometrically defined quantity in any spherically symmetric spacetime make it clear that $M_{\rm MSH}$ is defined in a geometric and, therefore, gauge-invariant way. In the Schwarzschild spacetime, $M_{\rm MSH}$ coincides with the Schwarzschild mass m but, in the conformally rescaled FLRW space (1), it receives contributions by the cosmological fluid (which, possibly, reduces to just the cosmological constant) and by the gravitational field. The transformation property of the Hawking-Hayward mass under conformal transformations $g_{ab} \to \tilde{g}_{ab} = \Omega^2 g_{ab}$, derived in [26, 27] and applied to perturbed FLRW spaces in [20, 21], is

$$\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH} = \Omega M_{\rm MSH} - \frac{R^3}{2\Omega}\nabla^c\Omega\nabla_c\Omega - R^2\nabla^c\Omega\nabla_c R\,, \tag{5}$$

[1] Lensing by astrophysical gravitational waves (tensor modes) is an ephemeral phenomenon which was studied, *e.g.*, in [24] and has never been observed in nature.

which in our case yields

$$\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH} = m\,a(t) + \frac{H^2\tilde{R}^3}{2}\,(1-2\phi) \tag{6}$$

$$\simeq m\,a(t) + \frac{H^2\tilde{R}^3}{2}\,, \tag{7}$$

expressed in terms of the comoving FLRW time t and of the areal radius of the perturbed FLRW space (1)

$$\tilde{R} = a(t) r\sqrt{1-2\phi} \simeq ar\,(1-\phi)\ . \tag{8}$$

Our quantification of the direct contribution of the cosmological fluid to lensing hinges on the decomposition (7) of the gravitating mass [20, 27] into a "local" part $m\,a(t)$, a "cosmological" part $H^2\tilde{R}^3/2$, and an "interaction" part $-H^2\tilde{R}^3\phi$. It may seem surprising that the contribution of the Newtonian mass m to $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ scales with $a(t)$, but this is not so strange if the local mass is regarded as a length scale (in units in which $G = c = 1$ it is one half of the Schwarzschild radius of the mass m, which is commonly regarded as a length scale in relativistic astrophysics). The second contribution to $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ can be written as $H^2\tilde{R}^3/2 = 4\pi\tilde{R}^3\rho/3$ by virtue of the Hamiltonian constraint

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}\,\rho \doteq \frac{\Lambda}{3}\,, \tag{9}$$

where ρ is the energy density of the cosmic fluid and the last equality is characterized by the symbol $\doteq$ denoting the fact that it holds only in the special case in which the cosmic fluid is composed solely of a cosmological constant Λ with density $\Lambda/(8\pi)$. The cosmological contribution to $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ is simply the mass of cosmic fluid enclosed by a sphere of radius $\tilde{R}$ [18]. The deflection angle will receive corresponding contributions of magnitudes $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}/\tilde{R}$ and $H^2\tilde{R}^2$, which can already be compared. They are both small in the gravitational lens systems usually considered (stars, galaxies, or galaxy clusters) but the second term (which is quadratic in the ratio lens size/Hubble radius H^{-1}) is much smaller than the first one (which is linear in the ratio Schwarzschild radius of the lens/size of the system). The interaction term $-H^2\tilde{R}^3\phi$ is naturally smaller than both and is included here only for comparison with previous literature. To illustrate the magnitude of these contributions consider, for example, a galaxy with mass $m \sim 10^{11} M_\odot$ and size $R \sim 25$ kpc at redshift $z \simeq 1$. Then, using $a_0/a = z+1$ and adopting the usual convention $a_0 = 1$ with the value $H_0 = 70\,{\rm km}/({\rm s}\cdot{\rm Mpc})$ (and restoring Newton's constant G and the speed of light c), one has

$$\frac{H^2\tilde{R}^3}{2c^2} \simeq 1.3\cdot 10^{10}\,{\rm m}\,, \tag{10}$$

$$\frac{Gma}{c^2} \simeq 7.4\cdot 10^{13}\,{\rm m}\,, \tag{11}$$

and their ratio is

$$\frac{H^2\tilde{R}^3/2c^2}{Gma/c^2} \simeq 2\cdot 10^{-4}\,, \tag{12}$$

hence the mass $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ in eq. (7) is completely dominated by the contribution due to the local gravitational lens mass and the contribution of the cosmological fluid is negligible in comparison.

We now replace ratios m/r in the deflection angle $\Delta\tilde{\varphi} = \Delta\varphi$ (eq. (3)) with ma/ar and we substitute the expressions of ma and ar obtained from eqs. (7) and (8) obtaining

$$\Delta\tilde{\varphi} = \frac{4ma}{ar} = \frac{4\left[\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH} - \frac{H^2\tilde{R}^3}{2}\,(1-2\phi)\right]}{\tilde{R}\,(1+\phi)}\,. \tag{13}$$

Since both $|\phi| \ll 1$ and $H^2\tilde{R}^2 \ll 1$, a first order expansion in these quantities yields

$$\Delta\tilde{\varphi} = \frac{4\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}}{\tilde{R}} - 2H^2\tilde{R}^2\,. \tag{14}$$

This is our main result. If the expression (7) of $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ is reintroduced into the deflection angle (13), the contributions to $\Delta\tilde{\varphi}$ due to the cosmological background cancel out exactly to leave $\Delta\tilde{\varphi} = 4m/r$. By taking the limit $m \to 0$ in $\Delta\tilde{\varphi}$, the deflection angle vanishes. The first non-vanishing contribution due to the cosmology is $+H^2\tilde{R}^2\phi$ which, using the numerical example above, contributes only a fraction $\sim 6.5\cdot 10^{-18}$ of the deflection angle caused by the local mass m.

In comparison with other calculations in the literature, our derivation is straightforward thanks to the conformal invariance of the deflection angle and to the previous derivation of the result (7). If the total gravitating mass $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ contained in a sphere of radius $\tilde{R} \simeq a(t)r$ is considered, eq. (14) seems to imply that the cosmological constant (or, more generally, dark energy) contributes to light deflection. In the special case of the Kottler metric for which $H^2 = \Lambda/3$ (but keep in mind that the result (14) is more general since it applies to any spatially flat FLRW background, not only to de Sitter), eq. (14) would lead to a contribution $-2\Lambda\tilde{R}^2/3$ deflecting light in the opposite direction of the deflection induced by the Newtonian mass m. However, when one splits the mass $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ of the first term $4\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}/\tilde{R}$ into local, cosmological, and interacting contributions according to eq. (7), the cosmological contribution cancels exactly the term $-2H^2\tilde{R}^2$, as described by eq. (13), hence it appears that the cosmological constant Λ, or the cosmic fluid, or their combination, do not contribute directly to lensing. Therefore, the statement that the cosmology (or, less generally, the cosmological constant Λ) does not contribute directly to light deflection depends on whether one wants to identify the lens mass with the Newtonian mass m or with the total physical mass $\tilde{M}_{\rm MSH}$ enclosed by a sphere centered on the spherical lens and radius equal to

the impact parameter. Sharp statements about the contribution of the cosmology to lensing should not be made without specifying this choice, but previous literature has ignored this aspect. We believe that one should include in the description of lensing the physical quasilocal mass, instead of the Newtonian mass of the lens, which is appropriate only when the latter is isolated and this is not the case when one wants to study the contribution of the cosmological background to lensing. In this light, the result (14) should clarify much of the debate in the literature [7–11]. The existing debate seems to be due to the fact that different authors actually pose different questions and do not investigate a problem formulated uniquely in an unambiguous way.

Finally, we comment on the use of the McVittie metric in the literature on lensing by Λ [11, 28]. The McVittie metric [15] is a spherically symmetric solution of the Einstein equations interpreted as describing a spherical inhomogeneity embedded in a FLRW universe. It interpolates between the Schwarschild and the FLRW geometries and it contains the Kottler solution as a special case [29], but it is time-dependent and more general. However, it cannot play a role analogous to that which the Schwarzschild space plays among asymptotically flat solutions of the vacuum Einstein equations. While the Schwarzschild geometry is the unique spherically symmetric, vacuum, asymptotically flat solution of the Einstein equations [1], there is no unique spherically symmetric, asymptotically FLRW solution of the Einstein equations. Using the areal radius R, the McVittie metric can be written as [30]

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2m}{R} - H^2(t)R^2\right) dt^2 - \frac{2H(t)R}{\sqrt{1-2m/R}}\, dtdR + \frac{dR^2}{1-2m/R} + R^2 d\Omega^2_{(2)}\,, \tag{15}$$

where m is a constant. It reduces to the Kottler metric when $H = \text{const}$. The Misner-Sharp-Hernandez mass contained in a sphere of areal radius R in this metric is calculated from eq. (4) as

$$M^{(\text{McV})}_{\text{MSH}} = m + \frac{H^2R^3}{2} = m + \frac{4\pi R^3}{3}\,\rho\,. \tag{16}$$

This mass splits cleanly into local and cosmological parts, although the McVittie metric is not conformal to Schwarzschild and eq. (16) is not computed using eq. (7) but is derived directly from the definition of Misner-Sharp-Hernandez mass (4). There is no local-cosmological interaction term in this exact expression and one could be led to believe that such an interaction term is absent in more realistic situations. More important, the local mass contribution to the McVittie geometry is constant (m instead of $ma(t)$),[2] and there is a spacelike singularity at a finite radius which, depending on the behaviour of the scale factor, is covered by a time-dependent apparent horizon. While, realistically, lensing is much more common in the weak-field than in the strong-field regime and the interpretation of the McVittie apparent horizon becomes less important, one is still using a very special solution of the Einstein equations to draw general conclusions, and the issue of constant m versus $m\,a(t)$ is at the core of the direct contribution of the cosmological constant to the deflection angle. The use of the perturbed FLRW space is more appropriate than that of special solutions of the Einstein equations to assess this contribution to lensing.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to Bishop's University and to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada for financial support.

[1] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity* (Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1984).
[2] C.M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, revised edition (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK 1993).
[3] F.J. Dyson, A.S. Eddington, and C. Davidson, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London* **220A**, 291 (1920).
[4] D. Walsh, R.F. Carswell, and R.J. Weymann, *Nature* **279**, 381 (1979).
[5] P. Schneider, J. Ehlers, and E.E. Falco, *Gravitational Lenses* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992).
[6] V. Perlick, *Living Rev. Relat.* **7**, 9 (2004).
[7] J.M. Islam, *Phys. Lett. A* **97**, 239 (1983); K. Lake, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 087301 (2002); F. Finelli, M. Galaverni, and A. Gruppuso, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 043003 (2007); W. Rindler and M. Ishak, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 043006 (2007); K. Lake, arXiv:0711.0673; M. Ishak, W. Rindler, J. Dossett, J. Moldenhauer, and C. Allison, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **388**, 1279 (2008); M. Ishak, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 103006 (2008); M. Park, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 023014 (2008); I.B. Khriplovich and A.A. Pomeransky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **17**, 2255 (2008); T. Schucker and N. Zaimen, *Astron. Astrophys.* **484**, 103 (2008); T. Schucker, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **41**, 67 (2009); **41**, 1595 (2009); M.

[2] This happens because, when the McVittie line element is written in isotropic coordinates in analogy with the perturbed FLRW of eq. (1), the quantity m/ar appears instead of m/r [15].

Ishak and W. Rindler, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **42**, 2247 (2010); M. Ishak, W. Rindler, and J. Dossett, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **403**, 2152.2156 (2010); A. Bhadra, S. Biswas and K. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**,063003 (2010); H. Miraghaei and M. Nouri-Zonoz, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **42**, 12, 2947 (2010); T. Biressa and J.A. de Freitas Pacheco, *Gen. Rel. Gravit.* **43**, 2649 (2011); H. Arakida and M. Kasai, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 023006 (2012); F. Hammad, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **28**, 1350181 (2013).

[8] D. Lebedev and K. Lake, arXiv:1308.4931.

[9] M. Sereno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 021301 (2009); *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 043004 (2008).

[10] F. Simpson, J.A. Peacock, and A.F. Heavens, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **402**, 2009 (2010).

[11] M.E. Aghili, B. Bolen, and L. Bombelli, arXiv:1408.0786; G.W. Gibbons, C.M. Warnick, and M.C. Werner, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **25**, 245009 (2008).

[12] L. Amendola and S. Tsujikawa, *Dark Energy, Theory and Observations* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).

[13] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).

[14] F. Kottler, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **361**, 401 (1918).

[15] C.G. McVittie, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **93**, 325 (1933).

[16] L.B. Szabados, *Living Rev. Relativity* **12**, 4 (2009).

[17] S. Hawking, *J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.)* **9**, 598 (1968).

[18] S.A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 831 (1994).

[19] C.W. Misner and D.H. Sharp, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, B571 (1964); W.C. Hernandez and C.W. Misner, *Astrophys. J.* **143**, 452 (1966).

[20] V. Faraoni, M. Lapierre-Léonard, and A. Prain, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 023511 (2015).

[21] V. Faraoni, M. Lapierre-Léonard, and A. Prain, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **10**, 013 (2015).

[22] V. Mukhanov, *Physical Foundations of Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK 2005).

[23] N.E. Chisari and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 123505 (2011); A. Silvestri, L. Pogosian, and R.V. Buniy, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 104015 (2013).

[24] J.A. Wheeler, *Rendiconti della Scuola Internazionale di Fisica "Enrico Fermi"*, 11th Course of the Varenna Summer School 1959, L. Radicati ed. (Zanichelli, Bologna, Italy, 1960), p. 67; D.M. Zipoy, *Phys. Rev.* **142**, 825 (1966); B. Bertotti, *General Relativity and Cosmology*, XLII Course of the Varenna Summer School, R.K. Sachs ed. (Academic Press, New York, 1971) p. 347; E.V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 1759 (1986); V. Faraoni, *Astrophys. Lett. Comm.* **35**, 305 (1996) [arXiv:astro-ph/9602154]; *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **7**, 409 (1998); R. Ragazzoni, G. Valente, E. Marchetti, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **345**, 100 (2003).

[25] S.A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 1938 (1996).

[26] A. Prain, V. Vitagliano, V. Faraoni, and M. Lapierre-Léonard, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **33**, 145008 (2016).

[27] V. Faraoni and V. Vitagliano, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 064015 (2014).

[28] O.F. Piattella, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 024020 (2016).

[29] M. Carrera and D. Giulini, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 043521 (2010).

[30] R. Nandra, A.N. Lasenby, and M.P. Hobson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **422**, 4, 2931 (2012); **422**, 2945 (2012).